

Remarks

Applicant requests reconsideration and allowance. Most of the claims were indicated as allowable in the prior office action. Claims 3-5 were objected to for not providing an antecedent for a limitation in the claims. That objection was overcome by amending those claims to depend from claim 2. Claims 1, 14 and 15 were rejected under 35 USC 102 (e) based on the Lesniak patent (US 6,623,322) and claim 2 was also rejected based on Lesniak applied under 35 USC 103.


Claim 1 and claim 22 are amended to broaden the location of the first bulkhead to be between the bow and the stern. This is consistent with the placement of one bulkhead 20 forward of the stern so that a second bulkhead 21 may be placed at the stern to define a rear compartment. The bulkhead is further identified as a rigid bulkhead. Applicant could argue that the limitation "bulkhead" inherently means a rigid material since most common definitions of the term use it to define a structural component that separates one compartment on a ship or boat from another.

It appears the office action read the limitation bulkhead on the flap 16 of the reference. The flap 16 is not rigid but instead is part of the collapsible fabric cover 10. In lieu of arguing inherency applicant added the limitation "rigid" to distinguish his bulkhead from the fabric flap 16 of the reference.

New dependent claim 23 defines the materials of the bulkhead. New dependent claim 24 locates the deck above a lateral midplane of the pontoons.

Applicant believes the application is now in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



Thomas R. FitzGerald
Reg. No. 26,730

Hicock & Barclay LLP
100 Chestnut Street
Suite 2000
Rochester, NY 14604-2404
585-296-4469